# APPENDIX C: VISUAL PREFERENCE SURVEY

<u> </u>	Group Ratings	Favorable Elements	Unfavorable Elements
Mbed-Use - small scale - uniform	3.0 3.5 4.5	<ul> <li>Like looks</li> <li>No parking showing</li> <li>Works in appropriate areas</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Maintenance</li> <li>Not viable for retail; too low density (in general &amp; for transit)</li> <li>Too close to curb; lacking setbacks, lawn, landscaping</li> <li>Storefronts overwhelmed by residential; business &amp; residential don't blend</li> <li>Sidewalk too narrow; streetscape lacking</li> </ul>
Mbod-Use - small coals VII. s	2-4 4.5 2.5	<ul><li>Viable for retail</li><li>Variety of eat/shop/live</li><li>Character</li><li>Walkable</li></ul>	<ul> <li>Material for residential</li> <li>Not good in mixed-use area; doesn't look like mixed-use</li> <li>No trees</li> <li>No setback</li> <li>Design; very boxy roof lines; very plain</li> <li>Scale too small (density-wise)</li> </ul>
Newst-Use a modition again	4+ 3.5 4.0	<ul> <li>Modulation</li> <li>Setback makes it pedestrian-friendly; building stepped-back</li> <li>Retail prominent</li> <li>Balconies</li> <li>Medium scale</li> </ul>	Low retail     Too low density
4	4.0 5.0 4.0	<ul> <li>Modulation</li> <li>Good architecture; less boxy; balcony nice; eclectic; rounded corner</li> <li>Good density</li> <li>Underground parking</li> </ul>	"Dead 1 <sup>st</sup> floor"     Materials     "Patchwork"

<u>Image</u>	Group Ratings	Favorable Elements	Unfavorable Elements
inage	3.0	Density	Density
5	1.5 1.0	Awnings nice for sidewalk	<ul> <li>Design; ugly; institutional; looks like a box; cornices; industrial</li> <li>Disliked overall</li> </ul>
Mandalista a la spa Gala	2.0 2.0 4.0	<ul> <li>Support lots of commercial</li> <li>Compatible with area needs</li> <li>Could work if needed</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Not community oriented</li> <li>Doesn't look like Overlake; density doesn't work in Redmond</li> <li>Too big; too high; very intimidating</li> </ul>
Mixed-Use - small retail (shops)	4+ 4.5 4.0	<ul> <li>Wonderful people spaces</li> <li>Breathable; walkable</li> <li>Good character; boutique look</li> <li>Good to mix with higher density</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Maintenance</li> <li>Low density; needs more housing</li> </ul>
Mixed-Uso - largo mtall	3.5	Grocery & residential     Would work in Overlake	Design     Low density
9 Parking structural arrivatural	4.0 5.0 4.0	<ul><li> Green for residents</li><li> Good design</li></ul>	<ul> <li>Materials for residential</li> <li>Design; "fake" shops</li> <li>Issue for bus/shuttle access/turnaround</li> </ul>
10 Partings outle lide main street	5.0 5.0 3.0	<ul> <li>Accessible nature necessary for retail</li> <li>Protects pedestrians</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Might cause traffic problems?</li> <li>Should have bulb-outs</li> <li>Not practical to accommodate everything</li> </ul>

Image	Group Ratings	Favorable Elements	Unfavorable Elements
11 Parking: behind	4.0 4.0 4.0	<ul> <li>Pedestrian access</li> <li>Good for commercial; parking works well</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Good landscaping to make it work</li> <li>Safety concerns</li> <li>Second thoughts about shopping if parking is harder</li> </ul>
12 Parking: In front	2+ 3.0 1.0	Good retail     Interior courtyard	<ul> <li>Parking too obvious; too much parking</li> <li>Not pedestrian friendly</li> </ul>
1/8  All the second of the sec	2.5 4.0		<ul> <li>Market won't support it</li> <li>Ugly materials</li> <li>Bad design; "ho-hum;" no balcony</li> <li>Not enough density</li> </ul>
14 Resident all modum acale	2+ 4.5 4.0	Landscaping     Good density	Design; corner too high     Need setbacks with landscaping
15	4.0 5.0 4.0	"Redmond" style     Comes to street nicely	No streetscape; create a pedestrian environment     Add design details
16	3.0 1.5	<ul><li>Materials (brick)</li><li>Details</li><li>Can work if appropriate</li></ul>	Too high?  Warehouse, loft look

<u>Image</u>	Group Ratings	Favorable Elements	Unfavorable Elements
	4.5 4.5 4.0	<ul> <li>More inviting</li> <li>Good curbs &amp; access; bulbouts; sidewalk parking</li> <li>Bike racks</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Barrier to needs of surrounding community</li> <li>Too much sidewalk</li> <li>Parking pockets</li> </ul>
Boulevard with median	3.0 5.0 3.0	<ul> <li>Green</li> <li>Necessary for successful highway access to retail; has access control to focus traffic to key retail areas</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Not pedestrian-friendly</li> <li>Too straight; not urban center</li> <li>Will not fit with scale of development we need in Overlake; need higher density to attract HCT</li> </ul>
Boulevard with parking pockets	4.0 5.0 4.0	<ul><li>On street parking</li><li>Green</li></ul>	<ul><li>Too little development surrounding street</li><li>Maintenance</li></ul>
Retail Place	5.0 5.0 5.0	<ul> <li>Density</li> <li>Moveable chairs</li> <li>Can get away from traffic; can get out to do something</li> </ul>	Maintenance     Add cover
2rl Park - Passivo	4.0 1.0 4.0	Open space; could enjoy quiet	<ul><li>Too passive; nothing happening</li><li>Ugly</li></ul>
Park - active	4.5 5.0 3.0	Great place for kids	Too much happening

lusana	Group	Favorable Floresute	Hufarrandhia Flancada
Image	Ratings	Favorable Elements	Unfavorable Elements
7799000 4	4.0	<ul> <li>Textured sidewalks</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Huge crossing; intimidating</li> </ul>
	5.0	<ul> <li>Activating street lights</li> </ul>	to seniors
	2.0		
The same			
Intersection Improvements: Pedestrian Bulbs			
	3.0	<ul> <li>Like gateway concept;</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Don't like archway; too</li> </ul>
24	1.0	important to welcome	pretentious
	3.0	people; sets understanding	Too standard set of signage
I A E		of area	<ul> <li>stress importance of</li> </ul>
			Overlake
The state of the s			
7			
Gateway feature			

## Overall comments from one group that did not rate the photos:

· Photos represent a very narrow scope of architecture

## Parking and residential development

- · Like parking behind the building
- On-street parking is not practical, people drive around a lot it's okay, but need more than just on the street
- Don't like large areas of asphalt in front of buildings
- Need to design better for transit access
- If parking is difficult, will negate retail success
- Lower scale parking is more appropriate to lower density residential
- Parking structures need softening, design treatment
- Orientation is important

## Streetscapes and boulevards

- Vision: need all varieties of streetscape and medians depends on needs of the street
- · Places to pull off, get out of traffic are good

#### Parks and open space

- Is there a need for active gathering place?
- Would like area that could be gathering, large enough for outdoor concerts

#### Gateways

• Is this important?

- How about a standard set of signage between Redmond and Bellevue to identify neighborhoods
- Jurisdictional boundaries are perhaps less important to how the area functions

### • Pedestrian areas

- Activation of street lights for crossing is a nice feature
- 148<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE is not conducive to pedestrian crossing solutions?